

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 10 are independent. Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 10, 13, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as anticipated by Hann et al.

Throughout the prosecution of this application, the Applicant has attempted to focus on when the claimed “first control line” is asserted. The claims originally recited that the first control line was asserted when valid data...appears in a slot of the repeating bus frame. This was last amended to read **whenever valid data...appears on the data bus in a slot of the repeating bus frame**. That amendment overcame the art then of record.

The Examiner’s rejection now relies on a new reference. The Hann et al. reference discloses use of the UTOPIA 2 protocol which involves the assertion of a CLAV line to indicate that a bus user has an ATM cell to put on the bus. The Examiner is interpreting the CLAV line to read on the claimed “first control line”. The Applicant believes that this is an inappropriate interpretation because the CLAV line is not used to indicate when valid data appears on the bus. It is used to indicate when data is available to be put on the bus. Nevertheless, in order to make it perfectly clear, independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended to indicate that the first control line is asserted **when and only when valid data... appears on the data bus in a slot of the repeating bus frame**. This clearly defines over the UTOPIA 2 CLAV protocol which requires that the CLAV be asserted **before** data appears on the bus and allows the CLAV to be de-asserted after the

start of the cell (SOC) is transmitted. Thus, the CLAV signal clearly does not meet the requirement of being asserted **when and only when** valid data is on the bus. CLAV is asserted when no data is on the bus and is de-asserted when valid data is on the bus.

Claims 2, 3, 8, 11, 12, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Hann et al. In view of the remarks made above, it is believed that this rejection is moot.

On May 25, 2007, Thomas A. Gallagher, an attorney for the Applicant, spoke by telephone with the Examiner regarding the amendment presented herein and the Examiner agreed that the added language **when and only when** does distinguish the claims over the cited art.

In light of all of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in order for allowance, and prompt allowance is earnestly requested. Should any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/David P. Gordon/

David P. Gordon
Reg. No. 29,996
Attorney for Applicant(s)

GORDON & JACOBSON, P.C.
60 Long Ridge Road
Suite 407
Stamford, CT 06902
Tel: (203) 323-1800

May 25, 2007